arXiv:1510.03265v1 [math.CA] 12 Oct 2015

On the Markov inequality in the L_2-norm with the Gegenbauer weight

A. Shadrin, G. Nikolov, D. Aleksov

Abstract

Let $w_\lambda(t) = (1-t^2)^{\lambda-1/2}$, $\lambda > -1/2$, be the Gegenbauer weight function, and $\|\cdot\|$ denote the associated L_2-norm, i.e.,

$$\|f\| := \Big(\int_{-1}^{1} w_\lambda(t)|f(t)|^2\,dt\Big)^{1/2}.$$

Denote by $\mathcal{P}_n$ the set of algebraic polynomials of degree not exceeding n. We study the best (i.e., the smallest) constant $c_{n,\lambda}$ in the Markov inequality

$$\|p'\| \le c_{n,\lambda}\,\|p\|, \qquad p \in \mathcal{P}_n,$$

and prove that

$$c_{n,\lambda} < \frac{(n+1)(n+2\lambda+1)}{2\sqrt{2\lambda+1}}, \qquad \lambda > -1/2\,.$$

Moreover, we prove that the extremal polynomial in this inequality is even or odd depending on whether n is even or odd.

1 Introduction

Throughout, $\mathcal{P}_n$ is the collection of algebraic polynomials of degree at most n. For $\lambda > -1/2$, $w_\lambda(t) = (1-t^2)^{\lambda-1/2}$ is the Gegenbauer weight function in $[-1,1]$, and $\|\cdot\|$ is the associated weighted $L_2[-1,1]$ norm, i.e.,

$$\|f\| := \Big(\int_{-1}^{1} w_\lambda(t)|f(t)|^2\,dt\Big)^{1/2}.$$

We study the Markov inequality inequality in this norm,

$$\|f'\| \le c\,\|f\|, \qquad f \in \mathcal{P}_n, \tag{1.1}$$

in particular, we are interested in the sharp constant $c_{n,\lambda}$ in (1.1),

$$c_{n,\lambda} := \sup_{\substack{f\in\mathcal{P}_n\\ f\neq 0}} \frac{\|f'\|}{\|f\|}\,. \tag{1.2}$$

A well-known fact (see, e.g., [6] or [9]) is that the sharp constant in a L_2 Markov-type inequality is equal to the largest singular value of a certain matrix. Despite of this simple characterization, not much is known about the sharp constant even in the classical case of the Gegenbauer weight function. Namely, in the case of a constant weight ($\lambda = 1/2$), E. Schmidt [11] found the sharp constant asymptotically, showing that

$$c_{n,1/2} = \frac{(n+3/2)^2}{\pi}\left(1 - \frac{\pi^2-3}{12(n+3/2)^2} + \frac{R_n}{(n+3/2)^4}\right)^{-1}, \quad n > 5 \tag{1.3}$$

with $-6 < R_n < 13$.

The situation is better for the L_2 norms induced by the other classical weight functions. For the Hermite weight $w(t) = e^{-t^2},\ t \in \mathbb{R}$ both the sharp constant and the extremal polynomial are known, resp. $c(n) = \sqrt{2n}$ and $p = H_n$, the n-th Hermite polynomial (see, e.g., [11]). For the Laguerre weight $w(t) = t^\alpha e^{-t},\ \alpha > -1,\ t \in (0, \infty)$, Turán [13] found the sharp constant in the case $\alpha = 0$, namely

$$c(n) = \Big(2 \sin \frac{\pi}{4n+2}\Big)^{-1}.$$

For more information on the history of the L_2 Markov-type inequalities, as well as for more general Markov-type inequalities for higher order derivatives and with different Laguerre and Gegenbauer L_2 norms, we refer the reader to the recent papers of A. Bötcher and P. Dörfler [2, 3, 4] and the references therein. In [3] the sharp constants are shown to be asymptotically equal to the norms of certain Volterra operators. In general, finding explicitly the best constants in these Markov-type inequalities and the norms of the related Volterra operators seem to be equally difficult tasks.

The aim of this paper is to derive an upper bound for the best constant $c_{n,\lambda}$ in the L_2 Markov-type inequality (1.1) associated with the Gegenbauer weight function w_λ. Our main result is the following:

Theorem 1.1 *The sharp constant $c_{n,\lambda}$ in the Markov-type inequality in the L_2 norm induced by the Gegenbauer weight function $w_\lambda,\ \lambda > -1/2$, satisfies the inequality*

$$c_{n,\lambda} < \frac{(n+1)(n+2\lambda+1)}{2\sqrt{2\lambda+1}}.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is given in the next section. Section 3 contains some remarks and comments, in particular, we show that the extremal polynomial in (1.2) is even or odd depending on whether n is even or odd (Theorem 3.1).

2 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let us start with fixing some notation. For $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $|\mathbf{t}|$ is the Euclidean norm of $\mathbf{t}$, $|\mathbf{t}| = (t_1^2 + t_2^2 + \cdots + t_n^2)^{1/2}$. The unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^n$ is denoted by $S^n,\ S^n := \{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^n\ :\ |t| = 1\}$. By $\mathbb{R}^n_+$ and S^n_+ we denote the subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and S^n, respectively, with non-negative coordinates.

The inner product of $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y},\ \mathbf{x},\ \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, is denoted by $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$, thus $|\mathbf{t}|^2 = (\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t})$.

Finally, the trace of a matrix $\mathbf{A} = (a_{i,j})_{n\times n}$ is denoted by $\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A})$,

$$\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i,i}\,.$$

The associated with w_λ orthogonal polynomials are the Gegenbauer polynomials $\{C_m^\lambda(t)\}_{m=0}^n$ (called also ultraspherical polynomials), see. e.g., [12, Chapther 4.7]. For $\lambda \neq 0$ they are normalized so that

$$\int_{-1}^{1} w_\lambda(t) C_j^\lambda(t) C_k^\lambda(t)\, dt = \delta_{j,k} h_k^2\,,$$

with $\delta_{j,k}$ being the Kronecker delta and

$$h_k^2 = h_{k,\lambda}^2 = \frac{2^{1-2\lambda}\pi\Gamma(k+2\lambda)}{k!(k+\lambda)\Gamma^2(\lambda)}\,.$$

Hence, the orthonormal polynomials associated with w_λ are given by

$$p_j(t) = h_j^{-1}\, C_j^\lambda(t), \qquad j = 0, 1, \ldots, n,$$

where, for simplicity, the dependence on λ is omitted hereafter.

On using the well-known identities (see [12, eqn. 4.7.11] and [1, eqn. 7.13])

$$\frac{d}{dt}\, C_j^\lambda(t) = 2\lambda\, C_{j-1}^{\lambda+1}(t)\,, \qquad j \geq 1$$

$$C_j^{\lambda+1}(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} \frac{j-2k+\lambda}{\lambda}\, C_{j-2k}^\lambda(t)$$

(these identities are true for $\lambda \neq 0$ only), we find

$$p_j'(t) = 2 \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor j-1/2 \rfloor} (j-2k-1+\lambda)\, \frac{h_{j-2k-1}}{h_j}\, p_{j-2k-1}(t)\,, \qquad j = 1, \ldots, n\,. \tag{2.1}$$

Since the representation of p_j' depends on the ratios of the h's rather than on the h's themselves, we find appropriate to remove the constant factor in h_k, defining hereafter h_k by

$$h_k = h_{k,\lambda} = \Big(\frac{\Gamma(k+2\lambda)}{k!(k+\lambda)}\Big)^{1/2}. \tag{2.2}$$

Notice that now (2.1) is true also for $\lambda = 0$.

Let $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $\|p\| = 1$. Our goal is to find upper bound for $\|p'\|$, which, by virtue of (1.2), will be an upper bound for $c_{n,\lambda}$ as well. Without loss of generality we may assume that

$$p(t) = \sum_{j=1}^n t_j\, p_j(t) \;\text{ with }\; \mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n\,,\;\; |\mathbf{t}| = 1\,.$$

From (2.1) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|p'\|^2 =& 4 \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \left(\sum_{j=k}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} (2k+\lambda-1)\, \frac{h_{2k-1}}{h_{2j}}\, t_{2j} \right)^2 \\ &+ 4 \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor n+1/2 \rfloor} \left(\sum_{j=k}^{\lfloor n+1/2 \rfloor} (2k+\lambda-2)\, \frac{h_{2k-2}}{h_{2j-1}}\, t_{2j-1} \right)^2 \\ =& 4\big[\big|\mathbf{C}_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}\mathbf{t}'\big|^2 + \big|\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\lfloor n+1/2 \rfloor}\mathbf{t}''\big|^2\big]\,. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

Here $\mathbf{t}' = (t_2, t_4, \ldots, t_{2\lfloor n/2 \rfloor})$, $\mathbf{t}'' = (t_1, t_3, \ldots, t_{2\lfloor n+1/2 \rfloor - 1})$, and for $m \in \mathbb{N},\ m \geq 2$, the $m \times m$ matrices $\mathbf{C}_m$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_m$ are defined by

$$\mathbf{C}_m = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 & \alpha_1\beta_2 & \cdots & \alpha_1\beta_m \\ 0 & \alpha_2\beta_2 & \cdots & \alpha_2\beta_m \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \alpha_m\beta_m \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_m = \begin{pmatrix} \widetilde{\alpha}_1\widetilde{\beta}_1 & \widetilde{\alpha}_1\widetilde{\beta}_2 & \cdots & \widetilde{\alpha}_1\widetilde{\beta}_m \\ 0 & \widetilde{\alpha}_2\widetilde{\beta}_2 & \cdots & \widetilde{\alpha}_2\widetilde{\beta}_m \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \widetilde{\alpha}_m\widetilde{\beta}_m \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$\alpha_k = (2k+\lambda-1)h_{2k-1} = \left(\frac{\Gamma(2k+2\lambda-1)(2k+\lambda-1)}{\Gamma(2k)} \right)^{1/2}, \tag{2.5}$$

$$\beta_k = \frac{1}{h_{2k}} = \left(\frac{\Gamma(2k+1)(2k+\lambda)}{\Gamma(2k+2\lambda)} \right)^{1/2}, \tag{2.6}$$

$$\widetilde{\alpha}_k = (2k+\lambda-2)h_{2k-2} = \left(\frac{\Gamma(2k+2\lambda-2)(2k+\lambda-2)}{\Gamma(2k-1)}\right)^{1/2}, \tag{2.7}$$

$$\widetilde{\beta}_k = \frac{1}{h_{2k-1}} = \left(\frac{\Gamma(2k)(2k+\lambda-1)}{\Gamma(2k+2\lambda-1)}\right)^{1/2}. \tag{2.8}$$

Next, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\mathbf{C}_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\mathbf{t}'\right|^2 &= \left(\mathbf{C}_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\mathbf{t}', \mathbf{C}_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\mathbf{t}'\right) = \left(\mathbf{C}_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}^\top \mathbf{C}_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\mathbf{t}', \mathbf{t}'\right) = \left(\mathbf{A}_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\mathbf{t}', \mathbf{t}'\right) \\ &\le \nu_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\left|\mathbf{t}'\right|^2,\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

where $\nu_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}$ is the largest eigenvalue of the positive definite matrix

$$\mathbf{A}_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} := \mathbf{C}_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}^\top \mathbf{C}_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}.$$

Analogously,

$$\left|\widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\lfloor n+1/2\rfloor}\mathbf{t}''\right|^2 = \left(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\lfloor n+1/2\rfloor}\mathbf{t}'', \mathbf{t}''\right) \le \widetilde{\nu}_{\lfloor n+1/2\rfloor}\left|\mathbf{t}''\right|^2 = \widetilde{\nu}_{\lfloor n+1/2\rfloor}\left(1-\left|\mathbf{t}'\right|^2\right), \tag{2.10}$$

where $\widetilde{\nu}_{\lfloor n+1/2\rfloor}$ is the largest eigenvalue of the positive definite matrix

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{\lfloor n+1/2\rfloor} := \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\lfloor n+1/2\rfloor}^\top \widetilde{\mathbf{C}}_{\lfloor n+1/2\rfloor}.$$

From (2.3), (2.9) and (2.10) we deduce that

$$\|p'\|^2 \le 4\,\max\left\{\nu_{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}, \widetilde{\nu}_{\lfloor n+1/2\rfloor}\right\}. \tag{2.11}$$

From (2.4) it follows that

$$\mathbf{A}_m = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1^2\beta_1^2 & \alpha_1^2\beta_1\beta_2 & \alpha_1^2\beta_1\beta_3 & \cdots & \alpha_1^2\beta_1\beta_m \\ \alpha_1^2\beta_1\beta_2 & \left(\sum_{j=1}^2\alpha_j^2\right)\beta_2^2 & \left(\sum_{j=1}^2\alpha_j^2\right)\beta_2\beta_3 & \cdots & \left(\sum_{j=1}^2\alpha_j^2\right)\beta_2\beta_m \\ \alpha_1^2\beta_1\beta_3 & \left(\sum_{j=1}^2\alpha_j^2\right)\beta_2\beta_3 & \left(\sum_{j=1}^3\alpha_j^2\right)\beta_3^2 & \cdots & \left(\sum_{j=1}^3\alpha_j^2\right)\beta_3\beta_m \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \alpha_1^2\beta_1\beta_m & \left(\sum_{j=1}^2\alpha_j^2\right)\beta_2\beta_m & \left(\sum_{j=1}^3\alpha_j^3\right)\beta_3\beta_m & \cdots & \left(\sum_{j=1}^m\alpha_j^2\right)\beta_m^2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.12}$$

and the same representation holds for $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m$ with α_k and β_k replaced by $\widetilde{\alpha}_k$ and $\widetilde{\beta}_k$, respectively.

Since $\mathbf{A}_m$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m$ are positive definite matrices, their largest eigenvalues ν_m and $\widetilde{\nu}_m$ do not exceed their traces:

$$\nu_m \le \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}_m) = \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j^2, \qquad \widetilde{\nu}_m \le \mathrm{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m) = \sum_{k=1}^m \widetilde{\beta}_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^k \widetilde{\alpha}_j^2. \tag{2.13}$$

For the evaluation of $\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}_m)$ and $\mathrm{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m)$ we shall need two lemmata.

Lemma 2.1 *The following identities hold:*

$$(i)\quad \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j^2 = \frac{\Gamma(2k+2\lambda+1)}{2(2\lambda+1)\Gamma(2k)}; \qquad (ii)\quad \beta_k^2\sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j^2 = \frac{2k(k+\lambda)(2k+\lambda)}{2\lambda+1}.$$

Proof. We apply induction with respect to k. For $k = 1$ (i) reduces to

$$(\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2\lambda + 1) = \frac{\Gamma(2\lambda + 3)}{2(2\lambda + 1)},$$

which easily follows from the property $\Gamma(x + 1) = x\,\Gamma(x)$. Assume that (i) is true for $k - 1 \in \mathbb{N}$, then the induction hypothesis and (2.5) imply

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j^2 &= (2k + \lambda - 1)\,\frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda - 1)}{\Gamma(2k)} + \frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda - 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2k - 2)} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda - 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2k)}\left[2(2\lambda + 1)(2k + \lambda - 1) + (2k - 2)(2k - 1)\right].\end{aligned}$$

For the term in the square brackets we have

$$2(2\lambda + 1)(2k + \lambda - 1) + (2k - 2)(2k - 1) = (2k + 2\lambda - 1)(2k + 2\lambda),$$

whence

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j^2 = (2k + 2\lambda - 1)(2k + 2\lambda)\,\frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda - 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2k)} = \frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda + 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2k)}.$$

The induction step is done, and this proves claim (i).

Now (ii) follows from (i) and (2.6):

$$\beta_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j^2 = \frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda + 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2k)} \cdot \frac{(2k + \lambda)\Gamma(2k + 1)}{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda)} = \frac{2k(k + \lambda)(2k + \lambda)}{2\lambda + 1}.$$

Lemma 2.2 *The following identities hold:*

$$(i) \quad \sum_{j=1}^{k} \widetilde{\alpha}_j^2 = \frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda)}{2(2\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2k - 1)}; \qquad (ii) \quad \widetilde{\beta}_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \widetilde{\alpha}_j^2 = \frac{(2k - 1)(2k + \lambda - 1)(2k + 2\lambda - 1)}{2(2\lambda + 1)}.$$

Proof. For the proof of (i) we use induction with respect to k. For $k = 1$ claim (i) becomes

$$\lambda\Gamma(2\lambda) = \frac{\Gamma(2\lambda + 2)}{2(2\lambda + 1)},$$

and it is obviously true. If we assume that (i) is true for $k - 1 \in \mathbb{N}$, then our assumption and (2.7) imply

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^{k} \widetilde{\alpha}_j^2 &= (2k + \lambda - 2)\,\frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda - 2)}{\Gamma(2k - 1)} + \frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda - 2)}{2(2\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2k - 3)} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda - 2)}{2(2\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2k - 1)}\left[2(2\lambda + 1)(2k + \lambda - 2) + (2k - 3)(2k - 2)\right].\end{aligned}$$

It is easily seen that

$$2(2\lambda + 1)(2k + \lambda - 2) + (2k - 3)(2k - 2) = (2k + 2\lambda - 2)(2k + 2\lambda - 1).$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} \widetilde{\alpha}_j^2 = (2k + 2\lambda - 2)(2k + 2\lambda - 1)\,\frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda - 2)}{2(2\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2k - 1)} = \frac{\Gamma(2k + 2\lambda)}{2(2\lambda + 1)\Gamma(2k - 1)},$$

and the induction proof of (i) is accomplished. The proof of (ii) follows from (i) and (2.8):

$$\widetilde{\beta}_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \widetilde{\alpha}_j^2 = \frac{\Gamma(2k+2\lambda)}{2(2\lambda+1)\Gamma(2k-1)} \cdot \frac{(2k+\lambda-1)\Gamma(2k)}{\Gamma(2k+2\lambda-1)} = \frac{(2k-1)(2k+\lambda-1)(2k+2\lambda-1)}{2(2\lambda+1)} \,.$$

We are prepared to evaluate the traces of $\mathbf{A}_m$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m$.

Lemma 2.3 *The traces of the matrices $\mathbf{A}_m$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m$ are given by*

$$\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}_m) = \frac{m(m+1)(m+\lambda)(m+\lambda+1)}{2\lambda+1} \,, \tag{2.14}$$

$$\mathrm{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m) = \frac{m(m+\lambda)(m^2+\lambda\, m-1/2)}{2\lambda+1} \,. \tag{2.15}$$

Moreover, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathrm{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m) < \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}_m) < \mathrm{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1}) \,. \tag{2.16}$$

Proof. We start with the proof of (2.14). By (2.13) and Lemma 2.1 (ii) we obtain

$$\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}_m) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \beta_k^2 \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j^2 \Big) = \frac{2}{2\lambda+1} \sum_{k=1}^{m} k(k+\lambda)(2k+\lambda) \,.$$

The proof of (2.14) is accomplished by showing by induction that

$$2 \sum_{k=1}^{m} k(k+\lambda)(2k+\lambda) = m(m+1)(m+\lambda)(m+\lambda+1) \,.$$

Indeed, the latter identity is true for $m=1$, and assuming it is true for $m-1 \in \mathbb{N}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \sum_{k=1}^{m} k(k+\lambda)(2k+\lambda) &= (m-1)m(m+\lambda-1)(m+\lambda) + 2m(m+\lambda)(2m+\lambda) \\ &= m(m+\lambda)\big[(m-1)(m+\lambda-1) + 2(2m+\lambda)\big] = m(m+1)(m+\lambda)(m+\lambda+1) \,. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (2.15) is similar to that of (2.14). We make use of (2.13) and Lemma 2.2 (ii) to obtain

$$\mathrm{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m) = \sum_{k=1}^{m} \widetilde{\beta}_k^2 \Big(\sum_{j=1}^{k} \widetilde{\alpha}_j^2 \Big) = \frac{1}{2(2\lambda+1)} \sum_{k=1}^{m} (2k-1)(2k+\lambda-1)(2k+2\lambda-1) \,,$$

and then apply induction with respect to m to show that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} (2k-1)(2k+\lambda-1)(2k+2\lambda-1) = m(m+\lambda)(2m^2+2\lambda\, m-1) \,.$$

This identity is obviously true for $m=1$, and if it is true for $m-1 \in \mathbb{N}$, then an easy calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^{m} (2k-1)(2k+\lambda-1)(2k+2\lambda-1) =& (m-1)(m+\lambda-1)\big(2(m-1)^2+2\lambda(m-1)-1\big)\big) \\ &+ (2m-1)(2m+\lambda-1)(2m+2\lambda-1)) \\ =& m(m+\lambda)(2m^2+2\lambda m-1) \,. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (2.15) is accomplished. The verification of inequalities (2.16) is straightforward, and therefore is omitted. Lemma 2.3 is proved.

If n is even, $n = 2m$, then $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor = \lfloor n + 1/2 \rfloor = m$, and by (2.11), (2.13) and Lemma 2.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|p'\|^2 \leq & 4\max\{\nu_m, \widetilde{\nu}_m\} \leq 4\max\{\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}_m), \mathrm{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m)\} = 4\,\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}_m) \\ = & \frac{4m(m+1)(m+\lambda)(m+\lambda+1)}{2\lambda+1} = \frac{n(n+2)(n+2\lambda)(n+2\lambda+2)}{4(2\lambda+1)} \\ < & \frac{(n+1)^2(n+2\lambda+1)^2}{4(2\lambda+1)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

If n is odd, $n = 2m+1$, then $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor = m$ and $\lfloor n + 1/2 \rfloor = m+1$. From (2.11), (2.13) and Lemma 2.3 we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\|p'\|^2 \leq & 4\max\{\nu_m, \widetilde{\nu}_{m+1}\} \leq 4\max\{\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A}_m), \mathrm{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1})\} = 4\,\mathrm{tr}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1}) \\ = & \frac{4(m+1)(m+\lambda+1)\big((m+1)^2+\lambda(m+1)-1/2\big)}{2\lambda+1} \\ = & \frac{(n+1)(n+2\lambda+1)\big((n+1)^2+2\lambda(n+1)-2\big)}{4(2\lambda+1)} \\ < & \frac{(n+1)^2(n+2\lambda+1)^2}{4(2\lambda+1)}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, whenever $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $\|p\| = 1$, we have

$$\|p'\| < \frac{(n+1)(n+2\lambda+1)}{2\sqrt{2\lambda+1}}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\|p'\| < \frac{(n+1)(n+2\lambda+1)}{2\sqrt{2\lambda+1}}\,\|p\|\,, \qquad p \in \mathcal{P}_n\,. \tag{2.17}$$

The latter inequality proves the desired estimate for $c_{n,\lambda}$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete.

3 Remarks

(1) Our proof of Theorem 1.1 makes use of the fact that the traces of the positive definite matrices $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m$, $\mathbf{A}_m$, and $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1}$ satisfy inequalities (2.16). We show below that, in fact, the largest eigenvalues of these matrices are ordered in the same way.

Lemma 3.1 *The largest eigenvalues $\widetilde{\nu}_m$, ν_m and $\widetilde{\nu}_{m+1}$ of the matrices $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m$, $\mathbf{A}_m$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1}$, respectively, satisfy the inequalities*

$$(0 <)\ \widetilde{\nu}_m < \nu_m < \widetilde{\nu}_{m+1}\,. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. Obviously, the elements $a_{k,i}$ of matrices $\mathbf{A}_m$ and the elements $\widetilde{a}_{k,i}$ of matrices $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m$ are positive, see see (2.12) and (2.5) – (2.8). We shall prove that they satisfy the inequalities

$$\widetilde{a}_{k,i} < a_{k,i} < \widetilde{a}_{k+1,i+1}\,. \tag{3.2}$$

Since $\mathbf{A}_m$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m$ are symmetric matrices, we may assume that $i \geq k \geq 1$, in which case (see(2.12))

$$a_{k,i} = \frac{\beta_i}{\beta_k}\left(\beta_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j^2\right), \qquad \widetilde{a}_{k,i} = \frac{\widetilde{\beta}_i}{\widetilde{\beta}_k}\left(\widetilde{\beta}_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^{k} \widetilde{\alpha}_j^2\right).$$

Let us prove first the left inequality in (3.2). On using (2.6), (2.8) and Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, we obtain

$$\frac{a_{k,i}}{\widetilde{a}_{k,i}} = \frac{2k+2\lambda}{2k-1}\,\sqrt{\varphi(2k)}\,\sqrt{\varphi(2i)}\,, \tag{3.3}$$

where

$$\varphi(x) := \frac{x(x+\lambda)}{(x+\lambda-1)(x+2\lambda-1)}\,, \qquad x \geq 2\,.$$

We consider separately two cases:

Case (i): $-1/2 < \lambda \leq 1$. In this case $\varphi(x) \geq 1$ for $x \geq 2$, and since $(2k+2\lambda)/(2k-1) > 1$, we conclude from (3.3) that $a_{k,i}/\widetilde{a}_{k,i} > 1$.

Case (ii): $\lambda > 1$. Since

$$\varphi'(x) = \frac{\lambda-1}{\lambda}\,\Big(\frac{2\lambda-1}{(x+2\lambda-1)^2} + \frac{1}{(x+\lambda-1)^2}\Big)\,,$$

in this case $\varphi(x)$ is monotone increasing for $x \geq 2$. From (3.3) and $i \geq k$ we obtain

$$\frac{a_{k,i}}{\widetilde{a}_{k,i}} \geq \frac{2k+2\lambda}{2k-1}\,\varphi(2k) = \frac{2k(2k+\lambda)(2k+2\lambda)}{(2k-1)(2k+\lambda-1)(2k+2\lambda-1)} > 1\,.$$

The right inequality in (3.2) is proved in the same fashion. Using again (2.6), (2.8) and Lemmas 2.1, 2.2, we obtain with the same φ as above that

$$\frac{\widetilde{a}_{k+1,i+1}}{a_{k,i}} = \frac{2k+2\lambda+1}{2k}\,\sqrt{\varphi(2k+1)}\,\sqrt{\varphi(2i+1)}\,.$$

The right-hand side here coincides with the right-hand side of (3.3) with k and i replaced by $k+1/2$ and $i+1/2$, respectively, hence it is greater than 1. Inequalities (3.2) are proved.

We are ready now to prove inequalities (3.1). Let $\widetilde{\mathbf{t}} \in S^m_+$ be the eigenvector of $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m$ corresponding to the eigenvalue $\widetilde{\nu}_m$, then by (3.2)

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\nu}_m &= \sup_{\mathbf{t}\in S^m}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}) = \sup_{\mathbf{t}\in S^m_+}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}) = (\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_m\widetilde{\mathbf{t}},\widetilde{\mathbf{t}})\\ &< (\mathbf{A}_m\widetilde{\mathbf{t}},\widetilde{\mathbf{t}}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{t}\in S^m_+}(\mathbf{A}_m\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}) = \sup_{\mathbf{t}\in S^m}(\mathbf{A}_m\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}) = \nu_m\,,\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

whence the first inequality in (3.1) is established.

If $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in S^m_+$ is the eigenvector of $\mathbf{A}_m$ corresponding to the eigenvalue ν_m, $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}} = (0,\boldsymbol{\tau}) \in S^{m+1}_+$, and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_m$ is the $m\times m$ matrix obtained from $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1}$ by deletion of its first row and column, then by (3.2)

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_m &= \sup_{\mathbf{t}\in S^m}(\mathbf{A}_m\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}) = \sup_{\mathbf{t}\in S^m_+}(\mathbf{A}_m\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}) = (\mathbf{A}_m\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{\tau})\\ &< (\hat{\mathbf{A}}_m\boldsymbol{\tau},\boldsymbol{\tau}) = (\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1}\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) \leq \sup_{\mathbf{t}\in S^{m+1}_+}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1}\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}) = \sup_{\mathbf{t}\in S^{m+1}}(\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1}\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}) = \widetilde{\nu}_{m+1}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

and the second inequality in (3.1) is settled. The proof of Lemma 3.1 is complete.

(2) With Lemma 3.1 at our disposal, let us turn back to the proof of Theorem 1.1. If $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $\|p\| = 1$, it follows from (2.3), (2.9), (2.10) combined with (3.4) and (3.5) that the upper bound for $\|p'\|^2$ given by (2.11) is attainable, and this upper bound is the best possible. If, e.g., $n = 2m$, then, with the notation from the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Lemma 3.1 we have

$$\|p'\|^2 = 4\nu_m$$

provided $\mathbf{t}' = \boldsymbol{\tau} \in S_+^m$ is the eigenvector of $\mathbf{A}_m$ corresponding to its largest eigenvalue ν_m and $\mathbf{t}''$ is the null vector in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Analogously, if $n = 2m+1$, then

$$\|p'\|^2 = 4\widetilde{\nu}_{m+1}$$

provided $\mathbf{t}'$ is the null vector in $\mathbb{R}^m$ and $\mathbf{t}'' \in S_+^{m+1}$ is the eigenvector of $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1}$ corresponding to $\widetilde{\nu}_{m+1}$, the largest eigenvalue of $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_{m+1}$.

Thus, we obtain the following (rather natural) result, which, by a different argument, has been proved for $\lambda \geq 0$ in [10]:

Theorem 3.2 *The sharp constant $c_{n,\lambda}$ in the Markov inequality in the L_2-norm induced by the Gegenbauer weight w_λ, $\lambda > -1/2$, is given by*

$$c_{n,\lambda} = \begin{cases} 2\sqrt{\nu_m}\,, & \text{if } n = 2m, \\ 2\sqrt{\widetilde{\nu}_{m+1}}\,, & \text{if } n = 2m+1\,. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$, $p \neq 0$, is an extremal polynomial in this inequality, i.e., $\|p'\| = c_{n,\lambda}\,\|p\|$, then, with some $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$p(t) = e^{i\theta} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor n-1/2 \rfloor} t_{n-2k}\, C_{n-2k}^{\lambda}(t)\,, \quad \text{with } \ t_n > 0 \quad \text{and } \ t_{n-2k} \geq 0,\ \ 1 \leq k \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

In particular, p is an even (resp., odd) polynomial if n is even (resp., odd).

(3) A brief look at the final part of the proof of Theorem 1.1 shows that we can get slightly better upper bounds for $\|p'\|$, and hence for $c_{n,\lambda}$, if we distinguish between the cases of even and odd n. As the resulting improvement is neglectable, and also requires separation of the cases $-1/2 < \lambda < 1/2$ and $\lambda \geq 1/2$, we skip the details.

(4) As a special case of [4, Theorem 1.2] (which can be obtained also by a result of Dörfler [7] about the best constants in the L_2 Markov inequalities with Laguerre's weights combined with an asymptotic relation between the best constants in the L_2 Markov inequalities with the Laguerre and the Gegenbauer weights [2, Theorem 1.2]), we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{c_{n,\lambda}}{n^2} = \frac{1}{2\, j_{\frac{2\lambda-3}{4},1}}\,, \tag{3.6}$$

where $j_{\nu,1}$ is the first positive zero of the Bessel function J_ν. Hence, $c_{n,\lambda} = O(n^2)$ as $n \to \infty$, and our upper bound for $c_{n,\lambda}$ given by Theorem 1.1 has the right order with respect to n. Let us point out that our Markov inequality (2.17) holds for all $\lambda > -1/2$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In contrast, (3.6) implies that whenever $c > \frac{1}{2\, j_{\frac{2\lambda-3}{4},1}}$, we have $\|p'\| \leq c\, n^2\, \|p\|$ for every $p \in \mathcal{P}_n$, if $n \geq n_0(c,\lambda)$. However, in general, neither $j_{\nu,1}$ nor $n_0(c,\lambda)$ is known explicitly.

By another result of Dörfler [6], (see [7, eqn. (4)]), we have

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2(2\lambda+1)(2\lambda+5)}} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{c_{n,\lambda}}{n^2} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\lambda+1}}\,, \tag{3.7}$$

thus Theorem 1.1 furnishes the same upper bound for $\lim c_{n,\lambda}/n^2$ as (3.7). A comparison of Schmidt's result [11] for $\lambda = 1/2$ and the upper bound in (3.7) shows that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{c_{n,1/2}}{n^2} = \frac{1}{\pi} = 0.318309\ldots < \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} = 0.353553\,.$$

In the special cases $\lambda = 0$ and $\lambda = 1$ Nikolov [10] proved the following tighter estimates:

$$0.472135 \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{c_{n,0}}{n^2} \leq 0.478849\,, \ \ 0.248549 \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{c_{n,1}}{n^2} \leq 0.256861\,.$$

Acknowledgements. The second- and the third named authors are partially supported by the Sofia University Research Fund through Grant 75/2015.

References

[1] R. ASKEY, Orthogonal polynomials and special functions, SIAM, Philadelphia, 1975.

[2] A. BÖTCHER AND P. DÖRFLER, Weighted Markov-type inequalities, norms of Volterra operators, and zeros of Bessel functions, *Math. Nachr.* **283**(2010), 357–367.

[3] A. BÖTCHER AND P. DÖRFLER, On the best constant in Markov-type inequalities involving Laguerre norms with different weights, *Monatsh. Math.* **5**(2011), 261–272.

[4] A. BÖTCHER AND P. DÖRFLER, On the best constant in Markov-type inequalities involving Gegenbauer norms with different weights, *Oper. Matr.* **161**(2010), 40–57.

[5] P. DÖRFLER, New inequalities of Markov type, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **18**(1987), 490–494.

[6] P. DÖRFLER, Über die bestmögliche Konstante in Markov-Ungleichungen mit Leguerre Gewicht, *Österreich. Akad. Wiss. Math.-Natur. Kl. Sitzungsber. II* **200**(1991), 13–20.

[7] P. DÖRFLER, Asymptotics of the best constant in a certain Markov-type inequality, *J. Approx. Theory* **114**(2002), 84–97.

[8] V. A. MARKOV, On functions which deviate least from zero in a given interval, Sankt-Petersburg, 1892; German translation: Math. Ann. 77 (1916), 213–258.

[9] G. V. MILOVANOVIĆ, D. S. MITRINOVIĆ, AND TH. M. RASSIAS, Topics in Polynomials: Extremal Problems, Inequalities, Zeros, World Scientific, Singapore, 1994.

[10] G. NIKOLOV, Markov-type inequalities in the L_2-norms induced by the Tchebycheff weights, *Arch. Ineq. Appl.* **1**(2003), 361–376.

[11] E. SCHMIDT, Über die nebst ihren Ableitungen orthogonalen Polynomensysteme und das zugehörige Extremum, *Math. Anal.* **119**(1944), 165–204.

[12] G. SZEGŐ, Orthogonal polynomials, AMS Colloq. Publ. **23**, AMS, Providence, RI, 1975.

[13] P. TURÁN, Remark on a theorem of Ehrhard Schmidt, *Mathematica* (Cluj) **2**(1960), 373–378.

ALEXEI SHADRIN

Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics (DAMTP)
Cambridge University
Wilberforce Road
Cambridge CB3 0WA
UNITED KINGDOM
E-mail: a.shadrin@damtp.cam.ac.uk

GENO NIKOLOV, DRAGOMIR ALEKSOV

Department of Mathematics
Universlty of Sofia
5 James Bourchier Blvd.
1164 Sofia
BULGARIA
E-mails: geno@fmi.uni-sofia.bg
dragomira@fmi.uni-sofia.bg